

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

In the first Office Action the Examiner allowed claims 33, 36, 38-40, 54, 57, 60, 61, 73, 76, 77, 79, 80, 88, 91, 94-96, 102 and 105-107, and rejected claims 8, 112 and 118 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, on grounds of indefiniteness. The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 10-11, 13, 16, 19-22, 27-29 and 30-32 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by Hamilton, and rejected the remaining claims under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the following combinations of references:

Claims	References
5, 12, 34, 35, 37	Hamilton, Smith
6-9, 15, 17, 18, 23, 24, 41-45, 46, 48-53, 62-65, 67-72, 81-87, 97-101, 108-124	Hamilton, McArdle
14, 55-56, 58, 59, 74, 75, 78, 89, 90, 92, 93, 103, 104	Hamilton, McArdle, Smith
25-26, 47, 66	Hamilton, McArdle, Barbara

Claim Cancellations

Claims 14-16, 41-47, 51-56, 58, 59, 62-67, 70-76, 81-107 and 109-116 are hereby cancelled without prejudice to the resubmission thereof in a continuation application.

Allowable Subject Matter

Allowed claims 33, 36, 38, 57 and 60 are hereby converted to independent form, without any narrowing of claim scope. Certain additional changes are made to claims 36, 38 and 57 to obviate possible issues regarding antecedent basis for certain terms noticed during the preparation of this amendment, i.e., the shared work area and the participant public work area. For similar reasons, allowed claim 39 is hereby made dependent upon claim 37, which is now dependent upon allowed claim 38.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §112

The objection to the term “practically infinite” is understood to apply to claims 8, 112 and 116. The term is hereby deleted from claim 8, which now more broadly recites that the scroll comprises a set of scrollable panels. Claims 112 and 116 are cancelled without prejudice.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claim 1

Claim 1 was rejected as anticipated by Hamilton. Without acquiescing in the §102 rejection, Applicant hereby amends claim 1 to include the limitation that the moderator workstation is adapted to identify a panel other than a currently displayed panel to acquire from a plurality of panels in a selected participant work area, and to transmit a request message to a participant workstation for the identified panel. See, e.g., FIGS. 4 and 6 and the corresponding description in the present application (e.g., paragraphs 0036 and 0042-0044).¹ That is, the claimed system allows a teacher, for example, to obtain one panel from a student as the student is working on a different panel.

This capability is particularly useful in embodiments operating according to the WYSIWISOW paradigm, discussed in the application (e.g., paragraph 0022), under which objects added to a teacher’s panel are routinely transmitted to student workstations but objects from student workstations are not automatically transmitted to the teacher. This is a relaxed version of the WYSIWIS paradigm, and it facilitates more efficient transfer of useful information while avoiding excess data transmission, such as would occur in a system in which all student activity is transmitted to the teacher’s workstation as the activity occurs.

With a system as in claim 1, a teacher may identify a desired panel containing a student’s *past work*, and the corresponding student workstation transmits the selected panel to the teacher workstation in response to the request message. Hamilton does not appear to disclose or suggest such a capability, nor does McCardle, which the Examiner cited against claim 9. Hamilton

¹ Paragraph numbers are the numbers of the paragraphs in the application as published. Note that the moderator may select from one or more participants.

enables a teacher to activate an icon for a particular student and to thus obtain the current image for that student (column 3, lines 39-37), but there is no apparent teaching or suggestion of a request message for acquisition of any *prior* page, for example, from the student's workstation. McCardle does not appear to teach or suggest that a moderator could retrieve a non-displayed page from a participant, and it is noteworthy in this regard that apparently only a participant can select a page on the participant's computer in the McCardle system.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 1 as amended is allowable over the prior art as a whole, as are all claims depending from claim 1, directly or indirectly, including claims 2-13 originally and now also including claims 30-32.

Claim 2

Claim 2 is believed to be allowable for the reasons stated above with respect to claim 1, and also because there is no apparent teaching or suggestion in the prior art of a system of the type claimed in which a moderator can identify *multiple panels* of interest and transmit a request message for the *identified multiple panels*, in response to which the identified panels are transmitted to the moderator workstation. A teacher may, for example, obtain the panel a selected student is currently working on and at the same time obtain several previous panels of the student's work.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 34

Claim 34, rejected over Hamilton in view of Smith, is hereby amended in a manner believed to be consistent with the Examiner's reasons for indication of allowable subject matter in claims 36 and 38. More specifically, claim 34 recites, *inter alia*, collision-avoidance functionality permitting a participant to place a first image in a shared work area visible to the moderator, the first image having a corresponding image in the participant work area that is not visible to the moderator. It is believed that the prior art fails to disclose or suggest such a combination of related images in a system of the type claimed.

Claim 35 is amended consistent with the amendment to claim 34, and claims 17-29, formerly dependent upon claim 16 (now cancelled), are hereby amended to depend directly or indirectly from claim 34.

Claim 108

Claim 108 is hereby amended to include limitations similar to those of claim 120, which was rejected over Hamilton in view of McCardle. It is not clear how the Examiner's comments regarding claims 118-120 (pages 29-30 of the Office Action) apply to those claims, particularly claim 120. The Examiner does not allege that McCardle discloses scrolls having multiple panels, with each panel having multiple objects, wherein the objects can be replayed by displaying them in the order they were added to a given panel. Amended claim 108 recites a system in which a workstation is adapted to replay the creation sequence of objects on a given panel in object-by-object fashion. See, e.g., FIG. 7 and paragraphs 0037 and 0048 of the present application. Referring to the object sequence and the adjacent evolving panel appearance in FIG. 7 as an example, a replay may start with the display of a complete circle, followed by the addition of a complete line, and so on.

The Examiner states that it would have been obvious to modify the system of Hamilton to include the scroll bars of McCardle, but that statement does not address claim 120 or amended claim 108. The claimed scroll is not a scroll bar. As indicated in the application, e.g., FIG. 6 and the corresponding description (paragraph 0036), each scroll comprises a set or series of panels, similar to a slide show. Moreover, a conventional scroll bar merely causes a whole page to move on a display. It does not add any object to the page, much less add objects in sequence in object-by-object fashion. The cited combination of teachings from Hamilton and McCardle does not include all the limitations of claim 108 as amended. "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art." MPEP §2143.03. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the cited combination of references does not support the rejection under §103.

Dependent claims 117-124 are believed to be allowable at least for the reasons applicable to claim 108 from which they depend.

New Claims

Claim 125

New claim 125 is submitted herewith and is believed to be allowable over Hamilton and all prior art of record. Hamilton appears to teach *point-by-point* transmission of hand-drawn images (see, e.g., FIGS. 3A-3B and the corresponding description in columns 7-9), as opposed to *object-by-object* transmission. In the system defined by new claim 125, the moderator workstation is programmed to enable the moderator to draw an object such as a line, circle or rectangle with a pen on a video tablet, for example, and transmit the drawn object only when it is complete, i.e., when the pen is lifted off of the surface. See, e.g., FIG. 7 and paragraphs 0048 and 0049 of the present application. No such teaching or suggestion is apparent in Hamilton, and it is respectfully submitted that the prior art as a whole neither teaches nor suggests a system as claimed.

Claim 126

New claim 126 is a method claim directed toward *object-by-object* transmission of images in an interactive learning environment. Whether or not any particular prior art device or system might have the potential for *object-by-object* transmission, it is respectfully submitted that the use of such an operating mode is novel in the claimed environment, and that the prior art as a whole does not fairly suggest to a person of ordinary skill in the art that it would be desirable to use such a method for interactive classroom instruction, for example.

Claim 127

New claim 127 is a method claim directed toward selective acquisition of panels from a participant's workstation, as opposed to the acquisition of all current activity. Using the present method, a teacher, for example, can review the past work of a selected student or students without having collected and stored the work as it was done. There is no apparent teaching or suggestion of such an interactive learning method in the prior art of record.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 127 is allowable along with claims 48-50, amended to depend therefrom.

Claim 128

New method claim 128 is directed toward an interactive learning method in which a participant helps avoid collisions by placing a first image in a shared work area visible to the moderator, the first image having a corresponding image in the participant work area that is not visible to the moderator. There is no evidence of such a technique in the cited prior art.

It is respectfully submitted that claim 128 is allowable along with claims 68, 69 and 77-80, amended to depend therefrom.

Claim 129

New claim 129 is a method claim directed toward the use of object-by-object replay of a complex image creation sequence on a given panel in a series or scroll of panels. There is no apparent teaching or suggestion of such an interactive learning method in the prior art of record.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks and amending changes, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-13, 17-40, 48-50, 57, 60, 61, 68, 69, 77-80, 108, and 117-129 now pending in the application are believed to be in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested. No new matter is introduced by this amendment.

The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney by telephone if it would expedite the allowance of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



William F. Bahret, Reg. No. 31,087
Bahret & Associates
320 N. Meridian St., Suite 510
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204
(317) 423-2300